

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 5-24, 26, and 28-36 which are pending in the above-identified application. The specification is amended as shown on page 2 of this response. Claims 1, 20 and 24 are amended while claims 4 and 25 are canceled herein. No new matter is added by the amendments.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication at numbered parts 32, 33 of the Office Action that claims 19, 25 and 31-36 are allowable and that claims 4, 13-18, 26 and 30 would be allowable if rewritten in an independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 20 are amended to respectively include subject matter of claims 4 and 25 which are deemed allowable by the Examiner.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and the following discussion, Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112:

At numbered part 9 of the Office Action, claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner contends that claim 24 is indefinite as it includes trademarks and trademarks cannot properly identify or describe a particular material or product. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the aforementioned amendments to this claim deleting the trademarks therein.

II. Objection to the Specification:

At numbered part 9, sub-section (a) the specification is objected to for not capitalizing the trademarks listed therein. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the aforementioned amendments to the specification capitalizing the trademarks therein.

III. Rejection of claims 1, 5 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osgar et al. (U.S. 5,102,010) in view of Bodicky et al. (U.S. 4,976,707) and further in view of Weiler et al. (U.S. 4,519,513). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the aforementioned amendment to claim 1 including subject matter of allowable claim 4.

IV. Rejection of claims 6-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 17 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Osgar et al. in view of Bodicky et al., Weiler et al. and further in view of Carlisle (U.S. 3,878,977). The subject claims depend from independent claim 1 which has been amended to include subject matter of allowable claim 4. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claims 6-12 depending therefrom.

V. Rejection of claims 20-22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 25 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber (U.S. 5,176,654), in view of Osgar et al. and in further view of Weiler et al. Claims 21, 22 depend from independent claim 20 which has been amended to include subject matter of allowable claim 25. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 20 and claims 21, 22 depending therefrom.

VI. Rejection of claim 23 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 29 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber, in view of Osgar et al., Weiler et al. and in further view of Keif (U.S. 6,303,152). Claim 23 depends from independent claim 20 which has been amended to include subject matter of allowable claim 25. Hence, this rejection should be

withdrawn with respect to claim 23 depending therefrom.

VII. Rejection of claim 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 30 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber, in view of Osgar et al., Weiler et al. and in further view of Andersson et al. (U.S. 5,934,273). Claim 24 depends from independent claim 20 which has been amended to include subject matter of allowable claim 25. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 24 depending therefrom.

VIII. Rejection of claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a):

At numbered part 31 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber, in view of Osgar et al., Weiler et al. and in further view of Bodicky et al. Claim 28 depends from independent claim 20 which has been amended to include subject matter of allowable claim 25. Hence, this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to claim 28 depending therefrom.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the instant claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. In the event there are any fees due and owing in connection with this matter, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 11-0223.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 9, 2010

s/Bhavani S. Rayaprolu/
Bhavani S. Rayaprolu
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 56,583

Gibson & Dernier LLP
900 Route 9 North, Suite 504
Woodbridge, NJ 07095
Tel: (732)634-7634
Fax: (732)634-6887

Patent Department
Boehringer Ingelheim Corp.
900 Ridgebury Road
P.O. Box 368
Ridgefield, CT 06877
Tel.: (203) 798-9988

P03-0449_Response_to_OA_of_06-17-2010.doc